

Appl. No. : 10/659,797  
Filed : September 11, 2003

### REMARKS

In response to the Office Action mailed September 20, 2005, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider the above-captioned application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following comments.

In the changes made by the current amendment, ~~deletions are shown by strikethrough~~, and additions are underlined.

Claims 1-7 and 11-17 are in prosecution.

The Examiner has stated that Claims 1, 2, 11 and 12 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112 2nd paragraph. The Examiner has further stated that dependent Claims 3-7 and 14-17 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the '112 rejection.

Applicant respectfully submits that, as amended, the claims do overcome the Section 112 rejection(s).

Thus, Claim 1 defines, in paragraph "g," "a first secondary conductor physically extending through the same single via hole . . . as said first primary conductor," (underlining added) and in paragraph "h," "a second secondary conductor physically extending through the same single via hole . . . as said primary conductor" (underlining added).

Claim 2 (and dependent Claims 3-7) now recites in paragraph "c," "a plurality of secondary conductors respectively physically extending through the same via holes in which said primary conductor is extended" (underlining added).

Claims 11 and 12 now recite "a second conductor physically passing through said same holes" (underlining added).

Claim 13 (and dependent Claims 14-17) now recites in paragraph "e," "a first secondary conductor in said slab of ferromagnetic material physically extending through the same via hole as said first primary conductor" (underlining added), and in paragraph "f," "a second secondary conductor physically extending through the same via hole in said slab of ferromagnetic material as said second primary conductors" (underlining added).

Claims 1, 2, 11, 12 and 13 have been further amended to emphasize the patentable aspects of the invention over prior art U.S. patents 5,300,911 – Walters and 5,487,274 – Walters. Claim 1 now defines in paragraph (f) "said first, second, third and fourth primary conductors coupled together so that the direction of current flowing in said first and third vias is opposite to

**Appl. No.** : **10/659,797**  
**Filed** : **September 11, 2003**

the direction of current flow in said second and fourth vias whereby resulting flux generated between each via has the same orientation where the four adjoining magnetic fields intersect.” This defined structure is not disclosed in the Walters’ patents. Compare Figures 5A, 6B, 6C and 6D of the Walters’ patents with applicant’s Figure 22.

Claim 2, as amended, defines in paragraph (d) “said primary conductors coupled together and said secondary conductors coupled together to (i) arrange the pattern of current flow so that current flowing in any single via will be in the opposite direction from the current flowing in any adjacent via in its same row or column of said spaced via holes.” As noted above with respect to Claim 1, the structure shown in the prior art Walters’ patents does not so arrange the pattern of current flow and does not, therefore, anticipate the claimed subject shown in applicants Figure 22.

Claims 11, 12, and 13 have also been amended to clearly distinguish over the Walters’ patents, the claims now defining “an additional hole through said printed circuitry outside the boundary of said slab of magnetic material, and a plated via formed in said additional hole in electrical contact with one of said electrical printed circuits. Referring to the prior art Walters’ patents, no hole and no plated via are shown outside the bounds of Walters’ ferrite 11.

#### CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the amended claims both resolve the Examiner’s rejections set forth in the outstanding Office Action and distinguish over the prior art. Accordingly, early issuance of a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

The undersigned has made a good faith effort to respond to all of the rejections in the case and to place the claims in condition for immediate allowance. Nevertheless, if any undeveloped issues remain or if any issues require clarification, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call Applicant's attorney, Louis J. Knobbe at (949) 721-2828 (direct line), to resolve such issue promptly.


**Appl. No.** : 10/659,797  
**Filed** : September 11, 2003

Please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-1410.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: June 7, 2006

By:   
Louis J. Knobbe  
Registration No. 18,780  
Attorney of Record  
Customer No. 20,995  
(949) 760-0404

2221138: clk/dpl  
051806